Militant Hindu Nationalism : The Early Phase

AD 654932

Guenter Lewy
Department of Government
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Religion and Revolution

A Study in Comparative Politics and Religion

Technical Report #2

April 1967

Research sponsored by the Advanced Research Projects Agency under Order number 883 and monitored by the Office of Naval Research, Group Psychology Branch under contract Nonr - 3357(08), NR 177-907.

The opinions expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Office of Naval Research, or the United States Government.

D D C
RECEIVED
JUL 31 1967
B

RECEIVED
JUL 25 1967
CFSTI

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

31

Contents

1. The Indian Political Tradition 1

2. The Rise of Indian Nationalism 5

3. The Theory and Practice of Militant Hindu Nationalism 8

4. The Heritage of Hindu Militancy 19

Notes 23

1. The Indian Political Tradition

During the first half of the nineteenth century many European as well as Indian writers tended to take a rather dismal view of India's culture. Thomas Babington Macaulay, for example, his confidence not impaired by his ignorance in this realm of knowledge, asserted flatly that "a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India" and that "all the historical information which has been collected from all the books written in the Sanscrit language is less valuable than what may be found in the most paltry abridgments used at preparatory schools in England." [1] Other savants made equally sweeping judgments about India's lack of genuine philosophical speculation and the despotic character of her political history. Many Indian intellectuals, impressed by Western ways of thinking, and anxious to demonstrate their modernity, vied with European thinkers in denouncing the backwardness of their own civilization and religious tradition and decried their tyrannical and superstitious nature.

Within several decades this negative appraisal of India's legacy had given way to a vigorous cultural nationalism which has yet to run its course. Stimulated by the interest of English and German scholars in Sanskrit literature and reacting defensively to foreign cultural penetration, India experienced a profound cultural renaissance. Its intellectuals now affirmed the cultural and spiritual superiority of ancient Aryan India to all other civilizations then or later and they discovered republican if not democratic features in the systems of government that had prevailed before the Muslim and British conquests. This sense of racial pride and cultural renewal in turn contributed decisively to the development of an active nationalist movement.

A disinterested examination of India's past reveals a far more complicated picture than either of the above two schools of thought had been willing to acknowledge. The political tradition of India is neither a record of unrelieved despotism nor is it a fountain of modern democracy. Hinduism, the dominant religion of India, is characterized by extraordinarily fluid doctrines and practices; it represents a highly complex array of forms and myths and styles of life, a "farrago of beliefs and customs" [2] which can and in fact has been used to justify political quietism, non-violent resistance to foreign domination, as well as revolutionary terrorism.

The Vedic hymns, the earliest historical record of the Indo-Aryan invaders of Northern India, composed between 1500-1000 B.C., reveal an optimistic outlook on life and lack the ascetic temper so important in later Indian religious thought. The gods of the Aryans were hero gods similar to those of Homeric times and their kings were warrior-kings dependent upon the support of tribal assemblies.

The acceptance of the king by his subjects cannot be understood in terms of modern elections, but, as one student of the period concludes, "the role of the people in the coronation ceremony, and their power to banish the king point to a degree of popular control in the Vedic age that was never equaled in later times." [3]

As the Aryan conquerors extended their domination over the darker aboriginals, class lines hardened. The king became increasingly dependent upon rite and magic and the power of the priest (brahmana) expanded. During this stage of Indian history, spanning the years 800-500 B.C. and known as the Brahmanic period, there emerged an increasingly rigid division of society into four classes -- priests, warriors, peasants and serfs -- which in modified form has survived to this day. The origin of the Indian caste system is still the subject of some controversy, but its significance for the development of the social order in later centuries is clear. Each class had its code of divinely and socially approved conduct and duties (dharma), and rank order were accepted as given and beyond challenge. Birth into a particular class was the result of actions (karma) in earlier existences and only by diligently fulfilling the obligations of his caste could an individual hope to be reborn into a higher stratum. In this life there was no escape from the caste order. Such a world view, as Max Weber observed, did not provide a basis for social protest, there was no natural equality before God, "no 'natural' order of men and things in contrast to positive social order. There was no sort of 'natural law'." [4] Salvation meant final emancipation from the cycle of rebirths to be attained through faithfully accepting the duties of one's station.

At the apex of the social pyramid stood the brahman, the authoritative interpretor of dharma, variously defined to include the sacred Vedic tradition, custom and the system of social duties. The royal chaplain (purohita) was especially important. He procured victory through his prayer and sacrifice, he provided guidance and at times he even served as the king's minister. Exalted as was the chief brahman's position, he did not in practice become a challenge to the secular authority. Unlike the Catholic priesthood in medieval Europe, the brahmans lacked a hierarchical church organization that could be used to build up temporal power. The separation of religious and secular spheres of authority was accepted and the system tended "to prevent irresponsible tyranny on the one hand, and thoroughgoing theocracy on the other." [5]

The position of the Brahmans was successfully challenged by the rival systems of Jainism and Buddhism. Both arose during the seventh century before the Christian era, that period of intellectual ferment in the world which also gave rise to Greek philosophy, the Hebrew prophets, Confucius and Zarathustra. But after about 200 A.D. both Jainism and Buddhism were gradually displaced again by the older

creed which, embellished and modified by heterodoxy, came to be known as Hinduism (the religion of the Hindus -- the Persian word for Indians). For reasons still only partially understood, the earlier optimistic temper of Vedic thought by now had been superseded by a wave of pessimism and a desire to escape from the world. The universe was seen lodged in a period of decline and decay from which there was no realistic hope of delivery. At the time of worst distress, according to one important school of Hindu cosmology, the universal god Vishnu would reappear as a messiah, judge the wicked and restore the original age of plenty and happiness. But this incarnation of Vishnu under the name Kalki was not expected before the year 32,899 (according to the Christian calendar) [6], and the remoteness of the divine savior's appearance is one of the main reasons why the idea of a messiah has not played a very significant role in Hinduism. [7]

Ancient and medieval Indian political thought saw man as inherently evil and sinful. Kingship was regarded as instituted by divine decree as the consequence and remedy for man's imperfection. Only government was considered able to preserve the social system and to prevent total ruin. [8] Political speculation emphasized order and cautioned against disturbing tradition and established institutions. It stressed the discharge of duties in a stratified social order and it was centered around the concept of civil obligation. Still, as Drekmeier points out, "there always existed for the Hindu, as for the Western liberal, a criterion above the state by which its actions could be judged. It was not the idea of the sanctity of the individual personality or the association; it was sacred law and tradition." [9] The subject as such had no rights in the modern sense but the ruler had duties and responsibilities under the sacred law from which privileges of the ruled could be inferred. Even the divine status which many Indian kings claimed did not confer arbitrary authority. At least in theory, only the king who fulfilled his duties could claim divine stature; divine right, as in medieval Europe, was "located in the institution of kingship and not in the king himself." [10] Moreover, divinity in the eyes of ancient India did not mean infallibility for even the gods were considered capable of sin. Hence even the doctrine of royal divinity did not shield the king from possible challenge by his subjects.

The primary duty of the king was the protection of his people. If he failed in this central task, he became subversive of dharma and most sources justify revolt against him. The Mahabharata, for example, the great epic of India, completed by about 400 A.D., says that "the subjects should arm themselves for killing that king who does not protect them, who simply plunders their riches, who confounds all distinctions." Such a king "should be killed by his subjects in a body like a dog that is affected with rabies and has

become mad." [11] According to some traditions, the gods and not the people were to be relied upon to punish the ruler who had failed to fulfill the obligations of his office -- a doctrine similar to the Chinese Mandate of Heaven concept [12] -- but nearly all theorists are agreed that the king was subordinate to the sacred law and brought destruction upon himself by defying it. "Though there was no constitutional restraint on the Hindu king, the dharmic code itself must have served as a powerful check on his conduct in office. For the king, like the humblest of his subjects, could be reborn in a despised form." [13]

Of course, the moral justification of revolt against a tyrannical ruler does not amount to the acceptance of popular sovereignty as some recent writers have argued. Monarchy was the form of government commonly adhered to and the history of pre-Muslim India knows many palace revolutions but not a single successful popular revolt. [14] The general spirit was one of acceptance of the stratified dharmic order, resignation to an imperfect world. The desire for a better life in the here and now was discouraged by the doctrine of karma and the general devaluation of earthly concerns. Freedom meant escape from the cycle of birth and rebirth; it related to the salvation of the soul rather than to the individual's status in society. Hence ancient India brought forth treatises on statecraft but no political philosophy in the Western sense. Political questions are answered through myths and legends, a fact that facilitated the emergence of divergent interpretaions of India's political heritage by the awakening country's nationalist movement.

2. The Rise of Indian Nationalism

Before the British conquest India had known episodic political dominions that included almost all of the vast country, but most of the time the subcontinent had been divided into warring states and had lacked a sense of national consciousness and unity. It was the impact of an alien conqueror that laid the groundwork for the emergence of a national movement which eventually succeeded in ousting the foreigner. Under British rule and through a fairly efficient administration India achieved political unification, a national economy and a modern system of communications. Most importantly, the introduction of English education created a new elite which absorbed Western ideas of freedom and democracy. Modern education brought forth a class of intellectuals that could transcend the boundaries of caste and province, and overcome India's confusion of tongues. It was this native intelligentsia educated along the lines of Western civilization that eventually supplied the leadership in India's nationalist movement. [15]

The first result of the arrival of European culture was a period of intellectual anarchy created by the collision between Western scepticism and scientific thought and traditional Hindu life. As mentioned earlier, Westernism became the fashion of the day and everything Eastern was denounced as backward and superstitious. "We have been subject," declared an Indian professor in a lecture delivered before an Indian audience, "to a three-fold tyranny; political tyranny, priestly tyranny, and a social tyranny or the tyranny of caste. Crushed down by this, no man has dared to stand and assert himself. . . . At present, however, though we live under a foreign government, we enjoy a freedom of thought and action, such as we never enjoyed before under our own Hindu princes." [16] But gradually this worship of all things Western gave way to a new pride in India's native heritage. As the nineteenth century progressed, educated Hindus became interested in their ancient literature and religion. The revival of Hinduism was helped along by the writings of European scholars like Max Muller, England's foremost Sanskritist, and by the enthusiasm of the Theosophical Society, led in India by Mrs. Annie Besant, for the values of Indian civilization. By about 1870 the pressure of Western cultural penetration and Christian missionary activity had provoked a reaction represented by Hindu cultural nationalism.

The exponents of Hindu revivalism argued that Western materialistic civilization was destructive of Indian culture and they preached the historic superiority of the Aryan tradition. With the aid of its ancient wisdom Hindu India could regain its old strength, the revival of the old culture would restore India's past greatness. The ancestral faith was to be rejuvenated and a new patriotism built and cultivated. Indian unity was linked to Hinduism for large numbers of Hindus were

found in every region of India. The Muslims and other native minorities were ignored. "In this idea of a common higher loyalty resting upon race, religion and civilisation were compounded all the basic ingredients of Hindu cultural nationalism; the doctrine of the unity of the Hindu race, the theory of Aryan superiority, the fable of an Aryan India which comprehended all Hindus as equals, and the romantic conviction that Hindu culture was destined to revive and flourish." [17]

The revival of Hinduism was accompanied by reform movements which sought to remove from Hindu life features like child marriage, widow burning and caste restrictions that by Western standards were deemed degenerate and reactionary. Some of these movements endeavoring to foster an enlightened practice of Hinduism, such as the Brahma Samaj founded in 1828 by Raja Rammohan Roy, developed before the emergence of Indian nationalism though the national movement later considered itself indebted to them. Others, like the Arya Samaj, started in 1875 by Swami Dayananda Saraswati, was frankly nationalistic from the very beginning. Using the rallying cry "Back to the Vedas" the Arya Samaj advocated the formation of a new national character and sought to inspire nationalists "with pride in the past and hope in the future." [18] Similarly, the Ramakrishna Mission, founded in 1892 by Swami Vivekananda in order to further the spiritual work of the Bengali mystic Ramakrishna, called for the building of an Indian nation on the basis of the Hindu religion. Vivekananda argued that liberty required freedom from all bondage -- physical, mental, as well as political -- and he thus incorporated the Western idea of political and social liberty into the classical Indian conception of freedom as spiritual salvation. [19]

Another important figure engaged in fusing national and religious ideas was the Bengali novelist Bankim Chandra Chatterjee whom his admirers have compared to Sir Walter Scott, particularly on account of the strongly patriotic character of his writings. In his most famous novel, Ananda Math (The Abbey of Bliss), published in 1882, Bankim combined country and divinity into the concept "the mother", and the poem Bande Mataram (Hail to the Mother) soon became the Marseillaise of the nationalist movement. "The concept of the divine Motherland," notes one critic, "equating as it did love of country with love of God, made an instinctive appeal to the devout Hindu peasantry, for whom the secular reformism and Westernized nationalism of the Moderate leaders [of the Indian National Congress] remained beyond comprehension." [20]

The last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed a quickening of nationalistic sentiment, especially in the politically more advanced province of Bengal. Surendranath Banerjea, a professor in Calcutta, organized secret societies which spread the nationalist and revolutionary ideas of George Washington, Kossuth, Garibaldi and Mazzini. New political journals like the Tribune in Lahore and

The Voice of India in Bombay furthered nationalist aims. The year 1885 saw the founding of the Indian National Congress, though the early years of this organization were marked by a very moderate and non-revolutionary outlook. The separation of India from Great Britain was not yet envisaged and India's progress was considered dependent upon British help. "Protests against government policies consisted of thoughtfully worded petitions calculated to appeal to the sense of reason and fair play of officials." [21] The Western-educated professional people dominating the Congress took pains to emphasize that religious affiliation was irrelevant to membership in an organization devoted to public secular affairs, but in practice the first meetings were predominantly Hindu in composition. For most of these men Indian nationalism was synonymous with Hindu nationalism.

The early nationalist movement was a movement of urban intellectuals who spoke a common language and had common grievances. The overwhelming majority of the population was not touched as can be seen from the fact that as late as 1930 only 2 per cent of all Indians could speak English -- for many years the tongue of the national movement. What gave the nationalists the beginning of a mass base was the upheaval resulting from the decision of the British government in December 1903 to partition Bengal, the largest and most populous province of British India. This move was strongly attacked by the nationalists from the very beginning as an attempt to create a split between Muslims and Hindus and thus undermine Bengali nationalism; mass agitation really got underway after the announcement of partition on July 19, 1905. A resolution to use only Indian-made articles led to the so-called Swadeshi movement (Swadeshi meaning "one's own country"). Other weapons included the boycott of British goods and a program of national education that involved the establishment of schools combining Western education with an emphasis on Indian culture. The anti-partition movement began in Bengal as an expression of Bengali nationalism but it quickly spread to other parts of India. Later Indian writers have called it "India's first Freedom's battle" and they have suggested that "it holds the same significant place in our national annals as does the French Revolution in the awakening of modern Europe." [22] Indeed, the Swadeshi movement soon assumed a clearly political character that increasingly used the slogan Swaraj or self-government, to be achieved through organized passive resistance, as its central idea.

The Congress formally endorsed the Swadeshi movement at its Calcutta meeting in 1906, but being a moderate body it showed no great enthusiasm for the boycott and other more radical tactics. It was the failure of the Congress majority to provide energetic leadership for the growing nationalist movement that in 1907 led to a split in its ranks and to the formation of a "New Party." Those in favor of constitutional methods of agitation became known as the Moderates; the radicals were called Nationalists or Extremists. The origins of the latter group reach back into the last years of the nineteenth century and their ideas centering around a militant Hindu nationalism continue to cast a powerful spell upon contemporary Indian politics.

3. The Theory and Practice of Militant Hindu Nationalism

The leaders of the "New Party" had been veteran activists in the Indian national movement for many years. Bal Gangadhar Tilak -- teacher, Sanskrit scholar and editor of two newspapers in Maharashtra province -- had been advocating a radical nationalist course since 1894. At that time he had organized the celebration of two annual festivals in honor of the Hindu God Ganpati and the Maratha leader Shivaji (who had led his people against their Muslim rulers); both festivals had swiftly become vehicles of building up Hindu solidarity and anti-British sentiment. After his first imprisonment in the nationalist cause in 1897 Tilak acquired the title Lokamanya (literally "Revered by the people") and to this day he is most commonly spoken of as "The Lokamanya." [23] In a book published at the height of anti-British agitation in 1910 the well-known British journalist, Valentine Chirol, suggested that "if any one can claim to be truly the father of Indian unrest, it is Bal Gangadhar Tilak." [24] Nehru referred to Tilak as "the father of Indian nationalism" and in 1920, on hearing of Tilak's death, Gandhi is said to have exclaimed, "My strongest bulwark is gone." [25]

No less distinguished and admired was Aurobindo Ghose, a Bengali who had received a thoroughly Western education in England but was soon attracted to the national movement and spent the last forty years of his life in seclusion as a Hindu philosopher-saint. As early as 1893 Aurobindo had attacked the Congress "as a middle-class organ selfish and disingenious in its public action and hollow in its professions of a large and disinterested patriotism." [26] During the years 1906-08 he edited the Bande Mataram, first a daily and later also a weekly newspaper in Calcutta, which until its suppression by the British bureaucracy, functioned as one of the main organs sustaining the Swadeshi movement. A Western scholar recently called Aurobindo "probably the outstanding intellectual associated with the revolutionary philosophy in Bengal." [27]

Where Aurobindo appealed to his countrymen through the sheer power of his writings, the third leader of the Extremists, Bipin Chandra Pal, excelled through his eloquence as a speaker. An author and educator in Bengal, Pal in 1901 began to publish the English weekly New India, another mouthpiece of militant Indian nationalism. During the anti-partition agitation he travelled extensively through all parts of the huge country; a report of the British Intelligence Branch referred to him as "the chief of the itinerant demagogues," a man "who did more to influence the minds of the masses against the Government than any one else." [28]

The fourth leader of the Extremists was a leading member of the bar in Lahore, capital of the Punjab, Lala Lajpat Rai. Indian writers

include him in the radical triumvirate of Lal, Bal and Pal, Lajpat Rai was one of the leaders of the Arya Samaj, of which he authored a history, and he quickly became the nationalist leader of the Northwest. His death in 1928 was precipitated by a beating administered by police during a political demonstration.

The leaders of the extremist bloc did not think alike on all issues and they revealed certain differences of temperament. "The writings of Pal and Aurobindo," notes one critic, "are characterized by an exalted, inspired and fervid emotionalism. . . . Tilak on the other hand had a strong sense of the real and the concrete. . . . and there is far less emphasis on the vision of the spiritualized society and the gnostic community." [29] Still, all of them shared certain important ideas and ways of thinking.

The Extremists were strongly influenced by the Hindu revivalism that had come to the fore during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Ancient India, Aurobindo wrote in Bande Mataram in 1907, had once been "the fountain of human light, the apex of human civilization, the examplar of courage and humanity, the perfection of good government and settled society, the mother of all religions, the teacher of all wisdom and philosophy." [30] Since those glorious days the country had suffered much and its pride had been trampled into the dust. Hunger, misery and despair had triumphed. But God had not forsaken his chosen people. Through a revival of the Hindu religion India could regain the exalted position it had once held. Hinduism provided the common tie that could overcome differences of caste, language and custom and reestablish unity and greatness. If we lay stress on the ancient tradition and heritage, Tilak appealed to his countrymen, and forget "all the minor differences that exist between different sects, then by the grace of providence we shall ere long be able to consolidate all the different sects into a mighty Hindu nation. This ought to be the ambition of every Hindu." [31]

Aurobindo in Bengal and Tilak in the Deccan at first worked at arousing local patriotism but this limited scope of their appeal soon gave way to a deeply religious nationalism that encompassed all of India. "This movement in Bengal," declared Aurobindo, "this movement of nationalism is not guided by any self-interest, ... It is a religion which we are trying to live. It is a religion by which we are trying to realize God in the nation, in our fellow-countrymen." [32] The new nationalism, Pal argued, represented not a mere civic or economic or political ideal. "It is a religion." [33] Religion, suggested Tilak, not only provided a tie between man and God but also between man and man. It, therefore, was "an element in nationality." [34] A religion of patriotism had been born, a faith that had its martyrs, a creed that held up before its converts a mighty ideal.

Central in this new religious patriotism was the love and worship of the divine motherland, a concept first developed by Chatterjee and

further enriched and brought to life through the poetic language of Aurobindo:

> The feeling of almost physical delight in the touch of the mother-soil, of the winds that blow from Indian seas, of the rivers that stream from Indian hills, in the hearing of Indian speech, music, poetry, in the familiar sights, sounds, habits, dress, manners of our Indian life, this is the physical root of that love. The pride in our past, the pain of our present, the passion for the future are its trunk and branches. Self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness, great service, high endurance for the country are its fruit. And the sap which keeps it alive is the realization of the Motherhood of God in the country, the vision of the Mother, the knowledge of the Mother, the perpetual contemplation, adoration and service of the Mother. [35]

God revealed himself in the history and greatness of the Indian nation. It was God who was behind Indian nationalism and saw to it that it would attain its goal. In his famous Uttarpara speech of 1909 Aurobindo described how Sri Krishna (one of the most important Hindu deities) had visited him in jail and had assured him of his help and guidance in these words: "I am in the nation and its uprising and ... what I will, shall be, not what others will. What I choose to bring about, no human power can stay." [36] God manifested himself in the national movement as well as in those who opposed it. "I am working in everybody and whatever men may think or do, they can do nothing but help on my purpose." [37] The repression of the English bureaucracy was the hammer of God that was beating India into shape so that it could be moulded into a mighty nation and become an instrument for God's work in the world.

The belief in the messianic greatness and mission of India drew strength from the newly discovered sense of national pride and uniqueness. The movement for the national liberation of India sought political emancipation not as an end in itself but as a precondition for the fulfillment of India's spiritual destiny. India was rising, said Aurobindo, "to shed the eternal light entrusted to her over the world." [38] It sought to develop Hindu spirituality, the essential keynote of which was the unity of God and man. "It seeks to bring the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, in a sense not realised by Christian consciousness in Europe or America. It seeks to establish a New Jerusalem in this world." [39] Even the somewhat less spiritual leaders in the extremist group emphasized the importance of the tie between India and the world. Patriorism, maintained Pal, "is good, excellent, divine only when it furthers the ends of universal humanity. Nationality divorced from humanity is a source of weakness and evil, and not of strength and good." [40]

The Extremists invoked God's help but warned against passive reliance upon devine delivery. They therefore worked hard at cultivating strength and determination in their followers. "Our actual enemy," Aurobindo wrote in 1893,"is not any force exterior to ourselves, but our own crying weaknesses, our cowardice, our selfishness, our hypocrisy, our purblind sentimantalism." [41] Nothing could be gained by begging and meek appeals to the good will of the foreign rulers -- the way of the Moderates dominating the Congress. "The Indian people," Tilak urged in the Kesari, "must adopt the way of resistance to achieve the complete rights of svarajya." [42] India's liberation will be achieved by the grace of God, but it will not do to sit idle. "There is a very old principle that God helps them who help themselves. The principle occurs in the Rigveda. God becomes incarnate. When? . . .God does not become incarnate for idle people. He becomes incarnate for industrious people. Therefore begin work." [43] People once awakened can not be put down like dogs and slaves, Lajpat Rai told the 21st meeting of the Congress in 1905. "Why be loyal? Once the policy of Boycott be adopted prepare for the consequences. Do not behave like cowards." [44] The old idea, declared Pal, was to get political rights by petitioning the government. "The new hope is to help the people to grow into these by their own internal strength and evolution. The spirit that is abroad in India today is the spirit of self-assertion and self-reliance." [45]

In order to encourage action and to overcome the Indian tradition of renunciation and escapism from the turmoil of this world, the Extremists, especially Tilak and Aurobindo, appealed to the authority of the Bhagavad Gita (The Song of the Lord) -- India's most popular book of devotion. The Gita is part of the Mahabharata, the over 1500 years old great Hindu epic, and for centuries it has been India's principal source of religious inspiration. On account of its popularity as well as its content this "New Testament of Hinduism" was ideally suited to provide religious sanction for the spirit of activist nationalism the Extremists sought to enhance.

The revolutionary movement in Bengal, which we will examine in more detail later, from the beginning found in the Gita "not only the charter of Indian independence but the sanctification of the most violent means for the overthrow of an alien rule." [46] During the winter of 1910-11, while he was held in a British jail in Mandalay, Tilak undertook a systematic and scholarly analysis of the Gita in order to derive from it the duty of all citizens to act for the liberation of the nation. The result was a book entitled Srimad Bhagavadgita Rahasya (The Secret Meaning of the Gita) that was published in 1915 and translated into several Indian languages as well as into English.

Tilak took issue with a widely accepted interpretaion according to which the Gita expounded the renunciation of action as the highest duty. This philosophy, he suggested, had been spread by Jainism and Buddhism and it had weakened India's defenses against foreign conquerors. The true spirit of the Gita required not the giving up of worldly life but remaining in it. The Gita, Tilak maintained, taught the obligation of fulfilling the duties of one's station in life "with a pure mind and without an eye to the fruit." [47] In order to achieve salvation and gain release from the cycle of rebirth one should not give up action, an imperative which in any event could not be realized, but rather act unselfishly and disinterestedly. Thus the warrior should not retreat from battle but fight without hate for the good of the country. "The Gita neither advises nor intends that when one becomes non-inimical, one should also become non-retaliatory." [48] Going one step further Tilak argued that the duty of acting for the public welfare was not only a caste duty but was "the duty of all citizens when the nation is threatened by internal decay or external oppression." [49]

Tilak believed that unlike previous interpretors of the Gita who had had a special ax to grind he had succeeded in discovering the famous book's true meaning. This claim is probably too ambitious. An outstanding American student of the Gita has noted the widely differing estimates of its fundamental philosophy and concluded: "like many another religious book, it is taken to prove almost anything." [50] Tilak's interpretation in his view was "neither better nor worse than scores of others." [51] Be that as it may, the fact remains that Tilak's work made an important contribution toward strengthening the vigor of the Indian nationalist movement. The "Father of Indian Unrest" was assisted in this endeavor by Aurobindo who likewise preached the importance of forceful assertion. "Politics," Aurobindo wrote in 1907, "is concerned with masses of mankind and not with individuals. To ask masses of mankind to act as saints, to rise to the height of divine love and practise it in relation to their adversaries or oppressors is to ignore human nature. It is to set a premium on injustice and violence by paralysing the hand of the deliverer when raised to strike. The Gita is the best answer to those who shrink from battle as a sin, and from aggression as a lowering of morality." [52]

Both Tilak and Aurobindo thus were able to derive the legitimacy of righteous violence from the Gita and their followers were quick to translate this doctrine into deeds. Even though the leaders of the extremist faction in their writings preserved care not to seem to be instigating violence they always make it clear that the question of the means to be used in India's struggle was one of tactics and not principle. Writing in 1907 Aurobindo distinguished three methods of resistance to oppression: (1) Passive resistance. (2) Assassinations, riots, strikes and agrarian risings. (3) Armed revolt. Aurobindo opted for the first of these methods but not, as he emphasized, because

of moral objections to the use of force. "The choice by a subject nation of the means it will use for vindicating its liberty is best determined by the circumstances of its servitude. The present circumstances in India seem to point to passive resistance as our most natural and suitable weapon. We would not for a moment be understood to base this conclusion upon any condemnation of other methods as in all circumstances criminal and unjustifiable." [53] The nationalist movement will adhere to passive resistance and respect the law, Pal declared in the same year, as long as the law respected the Indians' rights to life and property. Other means, such as those employed by the French, American and Russian revolutionists, may suggest themselves with the gradual unfolding of events. [54] And Tilak explained, "The time is surely not yet for lawlessness, for we have not yet exhausted all the possibilities of what may be claimed as legitimate and lawful action." [55]

Active resistance and the use of force thus could become necessary if the oppression of the English bureaucracy were to make the legal struggle for liberty impossible, if the foreign ruler were to use force to prevent orderly meetings. The right of self-defense then would justify retaliation. In the words of Aurobindo:

> Under certain circimstances, a civil struggle becomes in reality a battle and the morality of war is different from the morality of peace. To shrink from bloodshed and violence under such circumstances is a weakness deserving as severe a rebuke as Sri Krishna addressed to Arjuna when he shrank from the colossal civil slaughter on the field of Kurukshetra. Liberty is the life-breath of a nation; and when the life is attacked, when it is sought to suppress all chance of breathing by violent pressure, any and every means of self-preservation becomes right and justifiable, -- just as it is lawful for a man who is being strangled to rid himself of the pressure on his throat by any means in his power. [56]

The example of France showed that the progress of a country toward freedom will not always take the form of a "decent and orderly expansion" but may require "purification by blood and fire." [57] No method of action, Aurobindo insisted, is good or bad in itself "except as it truly helps or hinders our progress toward national emancipation." [58] Unrest, in the eyes of Lajpat Rai, was an essential harbinger of progress and India's release from political slavery necessitated her going through a "hell of unrest." [59]

In reply to those who denied the legitimacy of rebellion against established authority the Extremists invoked the right of revolt against tyranny. The duties of a king and his people were reciprocal, Tilak explained in 1907. Even though according to ancient scriptures and lawbooks the king or sovereign was part and parcel of the Godhead, this principle of divinity did not allow him absolute and arbitrary powers or require that his tyranny be quietly borne. "The divine king as soon as he ceases to be just ceases also to be divine. He becomes an asura [demon] and this depreciated divinity is forthwith replaced by a deity, the divinity of which is not so alloyed." [60] Thus even if the divinity of kingship was to be accepted, Tilak argued, oppression and injustice could not be justified and India's struggle against the tyranny of the British crown was legitimate.

Although all of the Extremists were scornful of the "mendicant" tactics of the Moderates, they differed on the meaning of the slogan Swaraj. For Tilak it meant home rule under British sovereignty. He fought for a self-governing India within the empire. For the others the ideal of self-government ruled out retaining any ties whatsoever to Britain. "Our ideal is freedom," declared Pal in 1906, "which means absence of all foreign control." [61] Aurobindo, similarly, demanded complete independence:

> This is the object which the new politics, the politics of the twentieth century, places before the people of India in their resistance to the present system of Government, -- not tinkerings and palliatives but the substitution for the autocratic bureaucracy, which at present misgoverns us, of a free constitutional and democratic system of government and the entire removal of foreign control in order to make way for perfect national liberty. [62]

The emergence of the "New Party" in 1907 came at a time when the Swadeshi movement had begun to awaken India's illiterate masses and the Extremists made great efforts to build up and solidify mass support for the nationalist cause. Wherever possible they cast off the use of English and resorted to the local languages of the common people. As a result the nationalist movement ceased to be the exclusive concern of the English educated intellectual elite and it began to assume the character of a mass movement. Under conditions of severe repression by the British bureaucracy this also meant, however, that the extremist leaders were unable to retain full control over their followers in the vast country. Some of the latter were not content with relying on passive resistance and went over to deeds of violence and individual terror.

Terrorism first showed its face in 1897 when the brothers Chapekar killed two government officers in Poona (Deccan). The two brothers, orthodox Brahmins, had formed a society for physical and military training which they called the "Society for the Removal of Obstacles to the Hindu Religion." [63] The close tie between orthodox Hinduism and political terrorism here first demonstrated was to continue to characterize the revolutionary movement for many years.

Violence manifested itself next in Bengal. In 1902 Barindra Ghose, the younger brother of Sri Aurobindo, began to organize there schools of physical training in order to remove the stigma of unmanliness and prepare young Bengalis for revolutionary action. His agitation fell upon fruitful soil after the announcement of the proposed partition of Bengal; a further stimulus was provided by the Japanese victories in Manchuria over Russia in 1904 -- widely heralded as the triumph of an Asian nation over a European power. The first revolutionary secret society, the Anushilan Samiti, was formed at this time in Calcutta, and soon branch societies sprang up in other parts of Bengal. Difficulties of communication prevented central direction of these groups but their plan of action was identical. They manufactured explosives, collected fire arms, trained in their use, and engaged in acts of terror against British officials as well as against Indians refusing to provide financial support. "Barendra spoke of political murder as a means of educating the people for facing death and daring anything for their country's sake. He believed there was a constant demand for political murders, in order to embolden the people and satisfy their desire for vengeance." [64]

From Bengal the terrorist movement spread to the Punjab and occasional acts of violence cropped up in other provinces as well. From 1906 to 1918 the British counted 210 "revolutionary outrages" in Bengal which took the lives of 82 and wounded 121 persons. [65] The Viceroy, Lord Minto, narrowly escaped death; four attempts were made upon the life of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. In 1908 at Muzafferpur in Bengal a bomb intended for a district magistrate killed two English ladies named Kennedy. In 1912 a bomb was thrown at Lord Hardinge, the successor to Minto, upon his state entry into Delhi which seriously wounded the Viceroy and killed and injured several of his attendants. Terroristic activities continued through the First World War though the heavy hand of government repression combined with the promise of reform gradually brought about a slackening of violence.

The revolutionary movement drew upon the ideas of Garibaldi, Mazzini and the Russian anarchists and nihilists, but Hindu religious inspiration always occupied a key place. The Gita, in particular, was studied extensively and interpreted as a call to all Indians to struggle boldly and fearlessly against evildoers, willing to face death if necessary. The goddess Kali or Durga, symbolizing conflict,

became the favorite deity of the revolutionaries and the ceremony of initiation required the new member to take a vow before the goddess with a sword and a copy of the Gita placed upon his head. A secretly printed leaflet called upon the youth of India to pledge themselves to the task of destroying the hated foreigner. The necessary physical and spiritual strength was to be gained by relying upon the Hindu religion.[64] The newspaper Jugantar (New Era), founded in March 1906 by Barindra Ghose and several other revolutionaries, soon reached an amazing popularity by expounding the doctrines of militant Hinduism. A typical article suggested that firm resolution could bring an end to English rule within a single day for the number of Englishmen was strictly limited. "Lay down your life, but first take a life. The worship of the goddess will not be consummated if you sacrifice your lives at the shrine of independence without shedding blood."[67] An article in another vernacular paper, entitled "The Potency of Vedic Prayers," reminded the reader of the duty of retaliation against alien oppressors: "Brahmans should take up arms and protect religion. When one is face to face with such people they should be slaughtered without hesitation. Not the slightest blame attaches to the slayer."[68]

The attitude of the Indian people to this cult of violence was ambivalent. In 1907 the Moderates in the Congress went on record as emphatically condemning "the detestable outrages and deeds of violence which have been committed recently in some parts of the country, and which are abhorrent to the loyal, humane and peace-loving nature of His Majesty's Indian subjects of every denomination.[69] In the same year the Arya Samaj, too, declared that it was dedicated to peace and order and condemned "revolutions, bloodshed, disorder, clannish malevolence and racial hatred" as fatal to the spread of the true Vedic religion.[70] But people in general did not share these sentiments. "When a bomb is thrown," noted Lajpat Rai, "the people genuinely condemn the bomb thrower, are sincere in their detestation, but when he is hanged or transported exiled , they are sorry for him. Their original abhorrence changes into sympathy and then into love. They are martyrs of the national cause. They may be misguided, even mad, but they are martyrs all the same."[71] Many in the educated community, if they did not approve of the bomb outrages, "maintained at all events that it served the Government right, and they were glad that the authorities were in danger."[72]

Those dedicated to the philosophy of the bomb considered themselves the pupils of Tilak, Aurobindo and Pal and they drew much of the inspiration for their deeds from the eloquent writings and speeches of these men. The emphasis of the Extremists on the necessity of resolution and sacrifice for achieving the goal of political emancipation imparted a spirit of revolution to the nationalist struggle. But the exact relationship of the leaders of the Extremists party to the terroristic movement is somewhat difficult to reconstruct. It is clear that none of the extremist leaders were ever directly involved in terrorist

activities, though Tilak and Aurobindo especially provided a philosophical and religious rationale for violence and at the very least condoned resort to it.

In June 1897, at a time when the strong measures taken by the British government against the spread of the plague in Poona had created considerable unrest and resentment, Tilak held the second of his Shivaji festivals. Several speakers celebrated Shivaji, the man who in 1659 had killed the Muslim General Afzal Khan and freed Maharashtra, and they held him up as an example to be followed in the struggle for independence. Tilak himself defended Shivaji's killing of the alien Muslim conqueror as the act of a great man that could not be judged by the canons of ordinary morality. He told the festive audience:

> Did Shivaji commit a sin in killing Afzal Khan? The answer to this question can be found in the Mahabharata itself. Shrimat Krishna preached in the Gita that we have a right even to kill our own guru and our kinsmen. No blame attaches to any person if he is doing deeds without being actuated by a desire to reap the fruits of his deeds ....If thieves enter our house and we have not strength enough in our fists to drive them out, we should without hesitation lock them up and burn them alive. God has not conferred upon the foreigners the grant inscribed on a copper plate to the Kingdom of Hindustan. [73]

About a week later the brothers Chapekar assassinated Walter Charles Rand, the strong man in charge of fighting the plague, and another British officer. Tilak knew the assassins, helped them elude the police though he probably was not privy to the plot itself. A recent student of Tilak, after careful review of the evidence, concludes that Tilak certainly approved of Rand's assassination, that he tried his best to aid and protect the Chapekars after he knew of their crime, that he may have helped inspire their action, and at any rate provided ethical justification for it based on the scripture they most revered.[74] In 1908, after the killing of the Kennedy ladies, Tilak denied that such an action could be regarded as an ordinary murder "owing to the supposition on the part of the perpetrators that they were doing a sort of beneficent act."[75] Tilak could not explicitly condone the killing but his readers certainly knew what he meant. There is no doubt that Tilak accepted violence in a righteous cause, including assassinations, as justifiable and free of the stain of sin.

Aurobindo held very similar views. "Aggression, he wrote in 1907, is unjust only when unprovoked; violence, unrighteous when used wantonly or for unrighteous ends."[76] At about the same time Aurobindo wrote a little book, entitled Bhawani Mandir (Temple of Bhawani), in which he outlined the founding of an order of young ascetics who would

consecrate themselves to the liberation of the motherland. The scheme envisaged a temple dedicated to the goddess Bhavani, a manifestation of Kali, hidden in a secret place where the members of the order would acquire strength in preparation for the armed struggle for independence. The pamphlet quickly became a kind of handbook for the revolutionary groups of Bengal. [77] There also is evidence to indicate that Aurobindo was in close contact with the group around the Jugantar weekly and that he maintained this active liaison until his withdrawal from politics in 1910. [78] Lieutenant-Governor Baker, in a letter to the Viceroy, characterized Aurobindo as "an active generator of revolutionary sentiment. He is imbued with a semi-religious fanaticism which is a powerful factor in attracting adherents to his cause: and I attribute the spread of seditious doctrines to him personally in a greater degree then to any other single individual in Bengal, or possibly in India." [79] This appraisal does not appear to be exaggerated.

4. The Heritage of Hindu Militancy

Unable to overcome the political apathy of the illiterate peasantry and lacking the necessary strength to score meaningful victories against the British, the revolutionary movement in Bengal and the rest of India gradually weakened. "Aurobindo's warning, or threat, that the nationalists would come knocking at the door of the Congress with a nation behind them never materialized; the nation as a whole remained dormant politically until new techniques for rousing it were tried in the 1920's by Gandhi." [80] By 1910 the revolutionaries had lost the guidance or inspiration of most of the extremist leaders. Tilak was imprisoned in Burma, Pal and Lajpat Rai were in voluntary exile in Britain, Aurobindo had abandoned politics and was devoting himself to spiritual pursuits. In the years that followed both Tilak and Pal condemned the cult of the bomb and stressed the need of working along constitutional paths. The rescinding of the partition of Bengal in 1911 and the mood of concilation created by the outbreak of the First World War paved the way for the return of the former Extremists to the Congress. By 1916 the old quarrel between Moderates and Extremists was essentially patched up; the Congress was committed to the attainment of Home rule by constitutional means. Tilak died in 1920 and leadership in the nationalist movement passed to Gandhi.

The achievement of Indian independence is usually attributed to Gandhi's non-violent resistance movement, but the contribution of the Extremists to the successful outcome of the nationalist struggle cannot be ignored. The very idea of passive resistance was first applied in India not by Gandhi but by the anti-partition movement in Bengal in which the Extremists played a leading role. While the violent methods pursued by the revolutionary movement, fathered and partly encouraged by the Extremists, did not lead to tangible results and actually increased British repression, the heavy hand of the bureaucracy reacting to the campaign of terror "increased anti-British feeling in the country, thus indirectly bolstering the general appeal of organized Indian nationalism."[81] Most importantly, the Extremists by appealing to religion and using religious symbolism were able to broaden the base of the nationalist movement. Joining religious and political ideals they in effect created Hindu nationalism and awoke the Indian masses from their stupor. They gave the people a form of political consciousness, a desire for independence, a feeling of patriotism and a motivation to participate in the liberation of their country. "They showed for the first time how it was possible to arouse a poor, traditionbound, politically unconscious mass of people to political action through the use of cultural techniques of appeal that were understandable to them." [82] In a country where the great majority of the people were Hindus and where religion was closely entwined with the development of Indian civilization, the cultivation

of such a religious nationalism was probably the only way to build a mass movement.[83] Gandhi, while differing from the Extremists on several basic issues, continued to make his appeal to the people in traditional, religious terms.

Several historical and sociological factors help to account for the dominantly religious and revivalistic character of Indian nationalism. These elements were absent from the development of European nationalism though in varying degrees they are present in other new nations that have recently emerged from Western tutelage. First, the hold of the Hindu religion over the Indian masses and the exalted position of the scriptures of ancient India had never been effectively challenged by either rationalism or modern science. The educated had gone through a period of Westernism but this stage was superseded by a powerful Hindu renaissance. As we have seen, this religious revivalism assumed definitely messianic overtones and it provided the basis for the emergence of Indian nationalism. "Messianism developed as a necessary counterpoise to political and economic subjection. Messianism implied that it did not matter if Europe was materially more powerful, because India was superior in the realm of intellect and definitely in the realm of spirit."[84] Lastly, the presence of a Muslim minority, its separatist aspirations encouraged by the British, intensified Hindu consciousness and strengthened the ethnic and religious element in Indian nationalism. Thus while the latter exhibited many of the same features as European nationalism -- romanticism, encouragement and pride in vernacular literature and native art, glorification of the past[85] -- it also was characterized by a distinctly religious style that had no European parallels. Indian nationalism was an indirect result of British rule and Western education. At the same time, national feeling was decisively shaped and moulded by traditional ideas without which Indian nationalism would hardly have attained its eventual powerful momentum.[86]

If the combination of religion and politics in the form of Hindu nationalism was crucial in the birth and growth of Indian national consciousness, it also exacted a heavy price which continues to be paid for to this day. Hindu nationalism almost certainly retarded much needed social reform. Unlike earlier Hindu reformers, many of the militant nationalists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century resolutely opposed all reforms of the status of widows, the age of marriage or of the caste system. "We have fumbled through the nineteenth century," wrote Aurobindo in 1907, "prattling of enlightenment and national regeneration; and the result has been not national progress, but national confusion and weakness .... political freedom is the life-breath of a nation; to attempt social reform, educational reform, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom, is the very height of ignorance and futility."[87] Tilak was even more vehement in denouncing such reforms as destructive interference and

tampering by foreigners in the religious life of the Hindu people. It may well be, as noted by a recent student of Tilak's life, that the latter was not really so much convinced of the harmfulness of social reform as "he appears to have been supremely aware of the fact that a potent method of achieving swift popularity was by criticizing unpopular innovations." [88] The end result was, nevertheless, that Tilak and his followers lent their prestige to the defense of practices and superstitions that were contributing to India's misery and povery; the distrust if not outright opposition to social reform by orthodox Hindus has remained a serious problem in India's striving for modernization.

Another serious liability of Hindu nationalism has been its impact on the relations between Muslims and Hindus. To be sure, all of the militant nationalist leaders stressed the importance of national unity in the struggle against the foreign oppressor and the Congress. repeatedly went on record as desiring the harmonious cooperation of the various communities inhabiting the country. But in point of fact the emphasis on Hinduism in Indian nationalism could not but exacerbate the latent hostility between Hindus and Muslims. Significantly, the Muslim League was founded in 1906 during the period of Extremist ascendancy in the Congress. [89] It is thus not farfetched to suggest that the Extremists bear a share of the responsibility for the communal riots that intermittently plagued the country in the 1920's and 1930's and for the partition of India and the disastrous bloodshed following in its wake.

Lastly, militant Hindu nationalism has provided much of the direct inspiration for India's Hindu communal parties. A young admirer and follower of Tilak, V.D. Savarkar, became the leader of the Hindu Mahasabha, the first of the Hindu communal organizations on the Indian political scene. K.B. Hedgewar, the founder in 1925 of the militant Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS; usually translated as National Volunteer Corps) was similarly a disciple of the early Tilak and in the period 1910-15 Hedgewar was in contract with Pal and torrorist groups in Calcutta. [90] The assassin of Gandhi in 1948 was a fanatical Hindu communalist who had had past associations with both the Hindu Mahasabha and the RSS, a fact leading to the temporary ban of the RSS. More recently the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, founded in 1951, has scored impressive gains. [91] The Jana Sangh rejects the communalist label which opponents have attempted to attach to it, but in fact its program is hardly distinguishable from that of its predecessors: Ban on cow slaughter, repeal of the Hindu Marriage Act and other "anti-Hindu" laws, a tough policy toward Pakistan, etc.

The leaders of the Congress have always stressed their unalterable opposition to communalist politics. On April 3, 1948, Nehru declared in the Constituent Assembly that "the alliance of religion and politics in the shape of communalism is a most dangerous alliance, and it yields the most abnormal kind of illegitimate brood." Again in December 1955

Nehru warned against the communalist trend: "It is a separatist trend. It is a disruptive trend. It is a trend full of hatred. It is a trend that is bad for India today." [92] But words will not eradicate communalism. The transition to modernity in a traditional society creates stresses and strains on which fundamentalism and communalism thrive. In a situation where industrialization and secularization cause serious social and psychological dislocations, communalism appears as the manager of protest. Appealing to both patriotic and religious sentiments, India's "communalist parties play up the solidarities, the securities, the privileged access to scarce resources which social structures like caste, religion and ethnolinguistic community have always afforded Indians and whose survival depends upon the retention of salient features of the traditional culture pattern." [93]

Communalism will continue to pose a challenge to political stability and social progress until India's secular statesmen will have solved the problems of population control, economic development and stable leadership. Millions are voting for the Congress party because it is the party of Gandhi and Nehru, both of whom were, and continue even after their death to be, the objects of deep personal devotion and reverence. For the masses, as the late M.N. Roy noted, Gandhi was indeed "A Mahatma -- a source of revealed religion and agency of supernatural power." [94] It remains to be seen whether the Indian people will be able to develop a similar sense of loyalty to the abstract ideal of secular democracy. Should this transfer of allegiance fail, the blame will fall in part upon the Extremists, who created Hindu nationalism , and upon their successors, who keep cultivating the "marriage of religion and politics" at a time when this union has ceased playing a constructive and progressive role.

Notes

1) Thomas Babington Macaulay, "Minute on Education," in William Theodore de Bary, ed., Sources of Indian Tradition (New York, 1964), II, 45.

2) Charles Drekmeier, Kingship and Community in Early India (Stanford, Calif., 1962), pp. 116-117.

3) Ibid., p. 22. See also A.S. Altekar, State and Government in Ancient India, 4th rev. ed. (Delhi, 1962), pp. 98-99.

4) Max Weber, The Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism, trans. Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale (Glencoe, Ill., 1958), p. 144.

5) Drekmeier, op. cit., p. 33.

6) Emil Abegg, Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran (Berlin, 1928), p.22.

7) Ibid., pp. 143-144. See also A.L. Basham, The Wonder that was India (New York, 1959), p. 307; M. Monier-Williams, Brahmanism and Hinduism, 4th rev. ed. (New York, 1891), p. 114.

8) Cf. A.L. Basham, "Some Fundamental Political Ideas of Ancient India," in C.H. Philips, ed., Politics and Society in India (New York, 1962), p. 12.

9) Drekmeier, op. cit., p. 298.

10) Ibid., p. 252.

11) The Mahabharata, ed. M.N. Dutt, XIII. 61, 32-33 (Calcutta, 1905), p. 142.

12) Cf. John W. Spellman, Political Theory of Ancient India: A Study of Kingship from the Earliest Times to circa A.D. 300 (Oxford, 1964), p. 232.

13) Drekmeier, op. cit., p. 249.

14) Basham, in Politics and Society in India, p. 21.

15) Cf. Bruce Tiebout McCully, English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism (New York, 1940).

16) Cited by Verney Lovett, A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement (London, 1920), pp. 29-30.

17) McCully, op. cit., p. 263.

18) Lala Lajpat Rai, The Arya Samaj (London, 1915), p. 172.

19) Cf. Dennis Dalton, "The Idea of Freedom in the Political Thought of Vivekananda and Aurobindo," in S.N. Mukherjee, ed., South Asian Affairs, no. 2 (St. Anthony's Papers, no. 18; Oxford, 1966), pp. 38-39.

20) Stephen N. Hay in de Bary, op. cit., p. 156.

21) D. Mackenzie Brown, The Nationalist Movement: Indian Political Thought from Ranade to Bhave (Berkeley, Calif., 1961), p. 75.

22) Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, India's Fight for Freedom or the Swadeshi Movement (1905-1906) (Calcutta, 1958), p. 40. See also the same writers' The Origins of the National Education Movement (Calcutta, 1957).

23) Stanley A. Wolpert, Tilak and Gokhale: Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India (Berkeley, Calif., 1962), p. 102.

24) Valentine Chirol, Indian Unrest (London, 1910), p. 41.

25) D. Mackenzie Brown, The White Umbrella: Indian Political Thought from Manu to Gandhi (Berkeley, Calif., 1953), pp. 84 and 176.

26) Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought (1893-1908) (Calcutta, 1958), p. 107 (hereafter cited as Mukherjee, Sri Aurobindo). The passage is from a series of articles entitled "New Lamps for Old" published in the Indu Prakash of Bombay in 1893.

27) Richard L. Park, 'The Rise of Militant Nationalism in Bengal (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1950), p. 226.

28) Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, Bipin Chandra Pal and India's Struggle for Swaraj (Calcutta, 1958), pp. 70-71 (hereafter cited as Mukherjee, B.C. Pal).

29) Vishwanath Prasad Varma, The Political Philosophy of Sri Aurobindo (New York, 1960), p. 441.

30) Bande Mataram, Daily edition, October 7, 1907, in Mukherjee, Sri Aurobindo, 146-147.

31) Tilak in 1906, Speeches of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, ed. by R.R. Srivastava (Fyzabad, 1917), p. 56 (hereafter cited as Tilak, Speeches).

32) Cited by Karan Singh, Prophet of Indian Nationalism: A Study of the Political Thought of Sri Aurobindo Ghosh 1893-1910 (London, 1963), p. 75.

33) Bipin Chandra Pal, Swadeshi and Swaraj (Calcutta, 1954), p. 291.

34) Tilak, Speeches, p. 53.

35) Aurobindo Ghose, The Doctrine of Passive Resistance (Calcutta, 1948), pp. 83-84 (hereafter cited as Aurobindo, Passive Resistance). This work was first published as a series of essays in Bande Mataram in April 1907.

36) Aurobindo Ghose, Speeches, 2nd rev. ed. (Calcutta, 1948), p. 72.

37) Ibid., p. 77.

38) Ibid., p. 67.

39) Bande Mataram, Weekly edition, June 19, 1908, in Mukherjee, Sri Aurobindo, 94-95.

40) Pal, op. cit., p. 222.

41) "New Lamps for Old" (1893), in Mukherjee, Sri Aurobindo, 71.

42) Kesari, February 4, 1908, p. 4, cited by Wolpert, op.cit., p. 214.

43) Bal Gangadhar Tilak, His Writings and Speeches (Madras, 1922), p. 199.

44) D. Argov, "Moderates and Extremists: Two Attitudes towards British Rule in India," in St. Anthony's Papers, no. 18 (Oxford, 1966), pp. 23-24.

45) Pal, op.cit., p. 55d.

46) Chirol, op.cit., p. 79.

47) Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Srimad Bhagavadgita Rahasya, trans, into English by B.S. Sukthankar (Poona, 1935), I, 552.

48) Ibid., p. 555.

49) D. Mackenzie Brown, "The Philosophy of Bal Gangadhar Tilak: Karma vs, Jnana in the Gita Rahasya," Journal of Asian Studies, XVII (1958), 197-206.

50) The Bhagavad Gita, trans, and interpreted by Franklin Edgerton (New York, 1965), preface, p. VIII.

51) Franklin Edgerton, Review of Tilak's Rahasya, Journal of the American Oriental Society, LVI (1936), 527.

52) Aurobindo, Passive Resistance, 81.

53) Ibid., p. 29.

54) Mukherjee, B.C. Pal, 76.

55) Speech on June 25, 1907, Tilak, Speeches, 165.

56) Aurobindo, Passive Resistance, 30.

57) New Lamps for Old (1893), in Mukherjee, Sri Aurobindo, 84.

58) Aurobindo, Passive Resistance, 68.

59) Cited by Argov, op.cit., pp. 28-29.

60) Speech on June 25, 1907, Tilak, Speeches, 170.

61) Pal, op.cit., p. 63.

62) Aurobindo, Passive Resistance, 16.

63) Sedition Committee 1918. Report (Calcutta, 1918), p. 2. This report was prepared by a committee of six government officials, headed by Mr. Justice Rowlatt, and represents a rich source of information on the terrorist movement -- albeit characterized by a hostile point of view.

64) M.N. Das, India Under Morley and Minto: Politics Behind Revolution, Repression and Reforms (London, 1964), pp. 115-116. See also the discussion of the secret societies in Park, op.cit., pp. 238-256.

65) Sedition Committee Report, 182; Park, op.cit., p. 251.

66) Ibid., pp. 23-24; Lawrence J.L.D. Zetland, The Heart of Aryavarta: A Study of the Psychology of Indian Unrest (Boston, 1925), pp. 82-84.

67) Cited by Chirol, op.cit., p. 94.

68) Ibid., pp. 70-71.

69) Resolution of the 23rd Congress, cited by Annie Besant, How India Wrought for Freedom (Madras, 1915), p. 485.

70) Lajpat Rai, op.cit., p. 169.

71) Lala Lajpat Rai, Young India: An Interpretation and a History of the Nationalist Movement from Within (New York, 1916), p. 233.

72) Das, op.cit., p. 117.

73) Kesari, May 15, 1897, quoted in Wolpert, op.cit., p. 87.

74) Ibid., p. 97.

75) Kesari, June 2, 1908, quoted in loc. cit.

76) Aurobindo, Passive Resistance, 87.

77) Park, op.cit., pp. 230-231.

78) Mukherjee, Sri Aurobindo, 56-57; Singh, op.cit., p. 104, calls him the "secret leader and inspirer of the violent, underground terrorist movement designed utterly to demoralize the British."

79) Baker to Minto, April 19, 1910, cited by Das, op.cit., p. 145.

80) Charles H. Heimsath, Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform (Princeton, N.J., 1964), p. 316.

81) Park, op.cit., p. 264.

82) Mindo Adenwalla, "Hindu Concepts and the Gita in Early Indian National Thought," in Robert K. Sakai, ed., Studies on Asia, 1961 (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961), p. 23.

83) Cf. Singh, op.cit., p. 77.

84) Varma, op.cit., p. 222.

85) Cf. Hans Kohn, A History of Nationalism in the East, trans. Margaret M. Green (New York, 1929), p. 9.

86) Cf. S.N. Mukherjee, "Introduction," St. Anthony's Papers, no. 18 (Oxford, 1966), pp. 14-15.

87) Aurobindo, Passive Resistance, 3.

88) Wolpert, op.cit., p. 302. See also Heimsath, op.cit., pp. 163-165.

89) This point is made by Donald E. Smith, India as a Secular State (Princeton, N.J., 1963), p. 455.

90) J.A. Curran, Militant Hinduism in Indian Politics: A Study of the R.S.S. (New York, 1951), pp. 9-10.

91) Cf. Craig Baxter, "The Jana Sangh: A Brief History," in Donald E, Smith, ed., South Asian Politics and Religion (Princeton, N.J., 1966), pp. 90-101.

92) Cited by Stephen Fuchs, Rebellious Prophets: A Study of Rebellious Movements in Indian Religions (London, 1965), p. 284.

93) Harold A. Gould, "Religion and Politics in a U.P. Constituency," in Smith, ed., South Asian Politics and Religion, 53.

94) Cited by Smith, India as a Secular State, 500.

Unclassified
Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D

Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) University of Massachusetts Amherst, Mass. 01002	2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified 2b. GROUP

3. REPORT TITLE

Militant Hindu Nationalism: The Early Phase

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)
Technical Report, April 1967

5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)

Guenter Lewy

6. REPORT DATE April 1967	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 27	7b. NO. OF REFS 47
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO Nonr 3357 (08) b. PROJECT NO NR 177-907 c. d.	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Technical Report #2 9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	

10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Distribution of this document is unlimited

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Advanced Research Projects Agency

13. ABSTRACT

Following a brief discussion of the Indian political tradition, the report analyzes the origins and significance of militant Hindu nationalism in the period 1880-1916. The ideas of several representative nationalist leaders -- B.G. Tilak, Aurobindo Ghose, Lajpat Rai, B.P. Pal -- are examined and their influence on the terrorist movement is discussed. The report concludes with some thoughts on contemporary Hindu communalism.

DD FORM 1 NOV 65 1473 (PAGE 1)
S/N 0101-807-6811

Unclassified
Security Classification

Unclassified
Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A ROLE	LINK A WT	LINK B ROLE	LINK B WT	LINK C ROLE	LINK C WT
Hinduism						
Hindu nationalism						
Tilak						
Aurobindo Ghose						
Hindu communalism						

DD FORM 1 NOV 65 1473 (BACK)
S/N 0101-807-6821

Unclassified
Security Classification

A-31409